UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/569,475	02/24/2006	Haruyuki Makio	1155-0293PUS	8543
2292 7590 01/20/2011 BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 EALLS CHURCH, VA 22040 0747			EXAMINER	
			ZEMEL, IRINA SOPJIA	
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1765	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/20/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/569,475	MAKIO ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Irina S. Zemel	1765		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timustill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	I. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 Ju 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro			
Disposition of Claims				
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1.3 and 4 is/are pending in the application Papers 4a) Of the above claim(s) 4 is/are withdrawn from 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1 and 3 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or are subjected to by the Examine.	em consideration.			
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the confidence and the correction are confidence as a second and the correction are confidence as a second are	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7-20-2010.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ite		

Art Unit: 1765

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over US 6160054 to Schwindeman et al., (hereinafter "Schwideman '054").

The disclosure of Schwidwman is discussed in detail in the previous office action. Insofar as the amendments to claims1 an 3 deleting the dienes from the scope of the claimed monomers, the reference still meets the limitation of suitable monomers. While the reference does not reference does not expressly disclose any other monomers suitable for the polymerization, as the starting materials, the reference expressly discloses hydrogenation of polymers obtained from conjugated diene monomers. See, for example, discussion in col. 15 of the reference. Such hydrogenation results in saturated polymers with structures identical to the structures of polymers obtained from olefinic monomers as starting materials. Since the claims are drawn to the product, i.e., the final polymer, the limitation "made from" (i.e., a process step limitation) is met regardless of whether the polymer is actually made from the claimed monomers or obtained from any other monomers so long as the final product is the same as the one obtained from the claimed monomers. Clearly, a polymer obtained via hydrogenation of polymer obtained via hudrogentaion of conjugated dienes will include, in its chain, at least some amounts of monomeric units that are identical to the claimed monomeric

Art Unit: 1765

unit, such as those, for example, as obtained from hydrogentaion of polymerized isoprene units and other dienes.

It is further noted that the reference expressly teaches modification of the polymer microctructure to increase the amounts of 1,2-inclusions.

Therefore, the claimed invention is still considered to have been anticipated by, or at least obvious from the disclosure of the cited reference.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 5-18-2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The only arguments relevant to the rejection of claims over Schwindeman presented by the applicants is that the disclosure of the reference is limited to diene and alkenyl aromatic monomers, which monomers are excluded from the claims as now amended. This arguments is addressed above in the body of the rejection. While the reference does not expressly disclose any other monomers suitable for the polymerization, as discussed above, the reference expressly discloses hydrogenation of polymers obtained from conjugated diene monomers. Such hydrogenation results in saturated polymers with structures identical to the structures of polymers obtained from olefinic polymers as starting materials. Therefore, as discussed above, the claimed invention is still considered to have been at least obvious from the disclosure of the cited reference.

Page 4

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Irina S. Zemel whose telephone number is (571)272-0577. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Seidleck can be reached on (571)272-1078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/ Irina S. Zemel/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1765

Irina S. Zemel Primary Examiner Art Unit 1765